REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. No claims have been amended. Claims 1 – 8 and 13 – 17 have been canceled. Claims 9 – 12 and 18 -24 are currently pending.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 9 – 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Thompson-Rohrlich, U.S. Patent No. 5,504,852 ("Thompson-Rohrlich"). Applicants respectfully traverse the present rejection, and respectfully submit that Thompson-Rohrlich fails to teach presenting "one or more display elements defined by at least a portion of the displayed items, wherein conflicts between said shell view schema and said one or more display elements are resolved in favor of said shell view schema," as required by independent claim 9.

Claim 9 recites two sources for display elements to be used to present a particular data store item. First, claim 9 describes a "shell view schema" that is used to displayed items having a particular "relationship type." Second, claim 9 recites "display elements defined" by a particular item. When conflicts arise between the view schema defined by the shell and the display elements defined by the item itself, claim 9 requires that such conflicts be "resolved in favor of said shell view schema."

To teach this requirement of claim 9, the Office Action provides the following explanation of its rejection:

> **conflicts between said shell view schema and said one or more**
>
> **display elements are resolved in favor of said view schema** equates to *Since*
> *file 13 meets both categorizations, it would need to be appear in both first folder*
> *16 and second folder 17. To avoid having to place a complete copy of file 13 in*

> *both places, the original file 13 can be stored in first folder 16, and an alias to the*
>
> *file 13 can be stored in the second folder 17*, col. 2, lines 26-40.

Office Action at pp. 25-26; *see also* Office Action at pp. 4-5. Applicants respectfully submit that conflicts between visual display characteristics (i.e., characteristics defined by the shell view schemas and characteristics defined by the item itself) do not equate to Thompson-Rohrlich's creation of an "alias" file.

By way of background, Thompson-Rohrlich discloses a computer system in which the stored files may be searched according to defined search criteria. For files meeting the search criteria, "aliases" to the files are created, and these aliases are organized together in a special display window for presenting the results of the search to the computer user. The program which performs the searching, aliasing and organizing function is called a "Viewer." The Viewer acts as an intelligent folder that continually searches for files meeting a specification supplied by the user. For each file found, an alias is created and this alias appears in the Viewer's folder and window.

The Office Action's reliance on Thompson-Rohrlich's creation of an "alias" file to teach the claimed techniques for handling conflicts between display attributes is flawed for three principle reasons. First, the fact that a file (i.e., file 13) meets the categorization of two different folders does not create a "conflict" because, as Thompson-Rohrlich teaches, the physical location of the file is immaterial in light of Thompson-Rohrlich's use of aliases. With such aliases, a file can be associated with any number of different folders, and there is no need to resolve conflicts in favor of one folder over another. Put simply, Thompson-Rohrlich teaches *avoiding* conflicts, not techniques for *dealing* with conflicts. In contrast, claim 9 contemplates

actual conflicts between display properties that must be resolved in favor of one of the two sources for display elements.

Second, even if Thompson-Rohrlich did disclose conflicts, it does not address conflicts between types of <u>display elements</u>. Indeed, the conflicts advanced by the Office Action relate to which folder a particular file should be assigned. Whether that file is assigned to folder A or folder B simply does not implicate the choice between display elements, i.e. display elements of a view schema defined by the shell and display elements defined by the item itself.

Third and finally, Thompson-Rohrlich does not teach the claimed resolution of conflicts required by claim 9. To teach the claim aspect-at-issue, the Office Action relies on Thompson-Rohrlich's creation of an alias file. Such an alias file allows the same file to be in two folders at the same time, thereby avoiding any conflict between the folders. In contrast, claim 9 expressly requires that conflicts be resolved "<u>in favor of said shell view schema.</u>" Thompson-Rohrlich fails to teach favoring one folder over another, and certainty does not teach favoring a shell's view schema over display properties defined by the item itself. Thus, for each of these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9 is in conditional for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants submit that dependent claims 10 - 12, which depend from claim 9, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 9.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 18 – 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson-Rohrlich and further in view of Dusker, *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 7,293,031 ("Dusker"). Applicants respectfully traverse the present rejection and submit that neither Thompson-Rohrlich nor Dusker teach the following aspects recited by the independent claim 18:

- presenting "one or more display elements defined by at least a portion of the displayed items, wherein conflicts between said shell view schema and said one or more display elements are resolved in favor of said shell view schema."

- "a plurality of shell view schemas that are associated with one or more relationship types, wherein each of at least a portion of said plurality of shell view schemas identifies one or more visual elements selected as appropriate for display with items of one of said one or more relationship types."

As previously discussed, Thompson-Rohrlich fails to teach the claimed resolution of "conflicts between said shell view schema and said one or more display elements . . . in favor of said shell view schema," as required by both independent claims 9 and 18. Dusker disclosures techniques for generating reports in an automated fashion, and Dusker also fails to teach the claimed resolution of conflicting display properties in favor of display elements from a shell's view schema. Thus, for all the reasons previously stated with respect to claim 9, claim 18 is also patentable over the art of record.

In addition, Thompson-Rohrlich and Dusker also fail to teach "shell view schemas" that identify "visual elements selected as appropriate for display with items of one of said one or more relationship types." To teach this aspect of the claimed invention, the Office Action primarily relies on Thompson-Rohrlich and its disclosure of a "Viewer." The Thompson-Rohrlich Viewer, however, does not include a *customized* display schema stored in association with items having a particular relationship. Indeed, it appears the Viewer presents items in accordance to a *default* view. *See* Thompson-Rohrlich, Figures 2 – 4. Clearly, Thompson-Rohrlich's Viewer does not contemplate the storing of a customized view having display elements selected as appropriate for presentation with the items returned by a particular set of search criteria. Thus, Thompson-Rohrlich fails to teach the "shell view schemas" that identify "visual elements selected as appropriate for display with items of one of said one or more relationship types," as recited by independent claim 18.

Likewise, Dusker also does not teach defining customized shell view schemas for "display with items of one of said <u>one or more relationship types</u>." Dusker merely teaches the creation of report templates that may be populated with data in an automated fashion. *See* Dusker, Abstract. Dusker's report templates clearly do not contemplate a shell's display of "items of one of said one or more relationship types," but rather provide a tailored template for inserting various calculations. *See* Dusker, col. 3, ll. 5 – 10. In sum, Thompson-Rohrlich and Dusker fail to teach "shell view schemas" that identify "visual elements selected as appropriate for display with items of one of said one or more relationship types." Thus, for this additional reason, independent claim 18 is in conditional for allowance. Applicants also submit that dependent claims 19 - 24, which depend from claim 18, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 18.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, claims 9 – 12 and 18 -24 are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Reckers/

Robert Reckers
Reg. No. 54,633

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: 816/474-6550
Fax: 816-421-5547